

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on September 13, 2005. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action and interview, and this paper in response thereto.

Claims 1–42 remain in this application. Claims 31–42 stand allowed. New claims 43–44 have been added without adding any new matter. No claims have been amended.

Claims 1–3, 6–9, 12–15, and 27–30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Helgeson (U.S. 5,530,457). Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, and 16–26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson in view of Ruth *et al.* (U.S. 6,278,429). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a “plurality of display outputs each for outputting a drive voltage to a row or a column of a display” and a plurality of “configuration bits each having a row/column setting” wherein “each configuration bit is exclusively associated with one or more of said plurality of display outputs such that said row/column setting of said configuration bit is used to configure all of said associated one or more display outputs for driving either rows or columns of the display.” The remaining rejected independent claims, and new claim 43, while having different scope, also recite limitations to configuration bits. As discussed during the personal interview, the cited reference does not teach these claim limitations.

Instead, as discussed during the personal interview, the items 66 and 68 cited by the Examiner in Fig. 5 of Helgeson are merely latches that hold the output data. The reference does not disclose or suggest a “configuration bit” as recited in claim 1 that is “associated” with one or more outputs and is settable.

The Examiner agreed during the personal interview that the cited reference did not teach the configuration bit as defined by claim 1. The Examiner agreed that a new search must be conducted and a new Office Action issued. Accordingly, the claims are patentable over the Helgeson reference. Because the Ruth reference does not overcome Helgeson’s shortcomings, the claims are patentable over the combination as well.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35835US1.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi – Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East Ninth Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: September 28, 2005